

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 23-5634 PA (SKx)	Date	August 24, 2023
Title	Bernard Robins v. City of Los Angeles, et al.		

Present: The Honorable	PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------

Kamilla Sali-Suleyman

Not Reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None

None

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS – COURT ORDER

The parties in this action have not filed a Joint Scheduling Report, which is required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), Local Rule 26, and the Court’s Order Scheduling Meeting of Counsel and Setting Scheduling Conference, dated July 14, 2023 (“Order Setting Scheduling Conference”). (Docket No. 8.) The Order Setting Scheduling Conference required the parties to submit their Joint Scheduling Report by August 14, 2023, and specifically warns: “The failure to submit a joint report in advance of the Scheduling Conference or the failure to attend the Scheduling Conference may result in the dismissal of the action, striking the answer and entering a default, and/or the imposition of sanctions.” (*Id.* at 3.)

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) provides that a defendant may move for dismissal of an action “[i]f the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order.” Although Rule 41(b) provides for dismissal on the motion of the defendant, the Court can also dismiss an action sua sponte pursuant to Rule 41(b). *See Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734 (1962); *see also Alexander v. Pac. Maritime Ass’n*, 434 F.2d 281, 283-84 (9th Cir. 1970). The permissive language of Rule 41 – that defendant “may” move for dismissal – does not limit the Court’s ability to dismiss sua sponte if the defendant makes no motion for dismissal. *Link*, 370 U.S. at 630, 82 S. Ct. at 1388-89. The Court has the inherent power to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases by dismissing actions pursuant to Rule 41(b) with prejudice for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with a court order. *See id.* at 629-30, 82 S. Ct. at 1388-89 (dismissal for failure to prosecute); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (same); *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 987 (9th Cir. 1999) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

In *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421 (9th Cir. 1986), the Ninth Circuit set forth five factors for a district court to consider before resorting to the penalty of dismissal: “(1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.” *Id.* at 1423. Cases involving sua

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 23-5634 PA (SKx)	Date	August 24, 2023
Title	Bernard Robins v. City of Los Angeles, et al.		

sponte dismissal merit special focus on considerations relating to the fifth Henderson factor. Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 399 (9th Cir. 1998). Dismissal is appropriate “where at least four factors support dismissal, . . . or where at least three factors ‘strongly’ support dismissal.” Id. (citing Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1263).

Here, in assessing the first Henderson factor, the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation, will be satisfied by a dismissal. See Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Yourish, 191 F.3d at 990 (public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal)). Relatedly, with respect to the second factor, the Court’s need to manage its docket will be served by dismissal. See id.

The third Henderson factor at least marginally favors dismissal. Defendants may be further prejudiced unless the complaint is dismissed. See Yourish, 191 F.3d at 991; Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at 642 (holding that failing to timely amend risks prejudice and can justify dismissal).

In considering the fourth and fifth Henderson factors, this Court’s Order Setting Scheduling Conference required the parties to file their Joint Scheduling Report by August 14, 2023, and warned that “failure to submit a joint report in advance of the Scheduling Conference . . . may result in the dismissal of the action.” (Docket No. 8.) Despite this warning, the parties have not submitted the required Joint Scheduling Report. Additionally, the Court intends to dismiss this action without prejudice. Accordingly, the fifth Henderson factor favors dismissal because the Court has adopted the “less-drastic” sanction of dismissal without prejudice. See McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 1996) (district court should first consider less drastic alternatives to dismissal with prejudice).

As a result of the parties’ failure to submit a Joint Scheduling Report, the Court dismisses this action without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b); see also Yourish, 191 F.3d at 986-88; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260. The Court will issue a Judgment consistent with this Order. The Scheduling Conference calendared for August 28, 2023 is vacated and taken off calendar.

IT IS SO ORDERED.